**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH**
**AT HYDERABAD**

## HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

**Writ Petition No.6626 of 2006**

–

**Dated: April 4, 2006**

–

–

–

**Between:**

M/s. Sree Eshvari Labour Contract
Cooperative Society, rep. by its
President R. Srinivasa Rao,
Siddipet, Medak District.

… Petitioner

And

The Commissioner, Andhra Pradesh
Vydya Vidhana Parishad, Hyderabad
and three others.

… Respondents

**Order:**

The petitioner, a Labour Contract Cooperative Society, has questioned the tender notice dated 21-03-2006, in which sealed tenders were invited by the Medical Superintendent, Area Hospital, Siddipet, Medak District, for the work of sanitation, cleaning the floor etc.

2. The petitioner society claims to have been doing the work of sanitation, cleaning of toilets and floor, at the Area Hospital and M.C. Hospital, Siddipet since 01-10-2002, on contract basis, which was being renewed every six months; the latest renewal being 11-11-2005 valid upto 31-03-2006. It is the case of the petitioner that the first respondent issued proceedings dated 02-02-2006 instructing the District Coordinators of hospital services to invite tenders for sanitation, pursuant to which a tender notice dated 22-03-2006 has been issued by the third respondent. The petitioner's grievance is that without considering the fact that it has been working for the last more than four years for a meager amount, the tender notice has been issued without notice to it.

3. The only submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner society had been discharging the duties that are called for to be done in the tender notice issued, for a meager amount. In spite of the same, the tender notice has been issued without considering the previous services of the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the Andhra Pradesh Vydya Vidhana Parishad, submits that new circular instructions have been given for award of work by following minimum notified wages.

5. Admittedly, the contract awarded to the petitioner has come to an end by 31-03-2006. Hence, the petitioner, whose contract period has already expired, does not have any right to claim continuance. Moreover, it is stated that the petitioner had also responded to the notice inviting tenders and the tenders have already been opened, but there is no information as to who was awarded the contract. In any event, there is no valid reason for issuance of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in issuing tender notice as illegal and no direction as sought for by the petitioner seeking continuance, can be given in this Writ Petition.

6. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

**JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.**

April 4, 2006

**MRR**